

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVOOD KHADEMI,

Plaintiff,

v.

SOUTH PLACER CO. JAIL, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-1498 KJM DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On September 27, 2022, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within thirty days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations. Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the findings and recommendations was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed

1 de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law  
2 by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court  
3 ....”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be  
4 supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

6 1. The findings and recommendations filed September 27, 2022, are adopted in full; and  
7 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See* E.D. Cal. R.  
8 183(b).

9 DATED: January 17, 2023.

10  
11   
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28